

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/539,549	MAGNEE ET AL.		
	Examiner G. NAGESH RAO	Art Unit 1714		
All Participants: (1) <u>G. NAGESH RAO</u> . (2) <u>Robert Crawford</u> .	Status of Application: _____			
Date of Interview: <u>23 July 2010</u>	Time: _____			
Type of Interview: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)				
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description: _____				
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: 1-5 and 8 under 102(b) via Wild 698, 1-3, 5, and 7-11 under 102(b) via Hamasaki 448, 6-7 and 9-11 under 103(a) via Wild 698 in view of Todd 825, and 4 and 6 under 103(a) via Hamasaki 448 in view of Todd 825.				
Claims discussed: 1-11				
Prior art documents discussed: Wild US Patent No. 5,310,698, Hamasaki US Patent No. 5,250,448, and Todd US Patent No. 6,821,825				
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.				
/G. Nagesh Rao/ Patent Examiner Art Unit 1714	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon review of the arguments filed and a further search, it was the examiner's position that claims 10-11 were considered allowable subject matter, and that if either limitations from claims 10 or 11 were incorporated into claim 1, this would help advance prosecution. Applicant's representative confirmed this amendment would be agreed upon by applicants and therefore expediting allowance of the application. .